Team Red CS1 Task 5 review team green

# Functional User Requirements

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Page** | **Req#** | **Category** | **Comment** |
| 2 | 1 | Comprehensibility | It is not clear what the scope of this knowledge database is. |
| 2 | 2 | Completeness | Whose medication -> Not specified, who as to validate the consumption the patient or the health visitor -> Unclear |
| 2 | 4 | Consistency | Functionalities concerning other user groups are outside the scope and should not be included. |
| 2 | 9 | Realism | Difficult to realize respecting data protection act and Dr. Patient confidentiality. Benefit is also not clear. |
| 2 | 11 | Completeness | It is not clear what "grafische Dokumente" are. What is a graphical document? |
| 2,3 | ALL | Completeness | Not mentioned that the user wants to initially create appointments in their timetable. See 15, 21, 22 |
| 2,3 | ALL | Completeness | Core requirements are missing such as Timetable, Patient dossier, etc... |

# Non-Functional User Requirements

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Page** | **Req#** | **Category** | **Comment** |
| 3 | 2 | Verifiability / Realism | Provide a server/system up time in %. "Always" is not a reachable goal. Consider a fallback scenario for when the system doesn't work (e.g. printouts of some documents) |
| 3 | 3 | Traceability / Verifiability | Reliable is not a requirement, it is not precise and can’t be measured. What is reliable. |
| 3 | 4 | Verifiability | Short loading time and good performance is subjective and can't be quantified. Especially mention the case that the application must be loaded over a slow 2G/3G connection when Wi-Fi/4G is unavailable. |
| 3 | 5 | Verifiability | User friendly and intuitive, needs further specification, otherwise it is hard to measure. |
| 4 | 6 | Verifiability | Not verifiable, it should be specified in which way it should be flexible. |
| 3,4 | ALL | Completeness | Should state on what device types the applications runs |

# Functional System requirements

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Page** | **Req#** | **Category** | **Comment** |
| 10 | 2 | Comprehensibility | It's not clear what data is mentioned here. If this refers to the backup case of 1, this should be clearly stated. |

# Non-Functional System requirements

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Page** | **Req#** | **Category** | **Comment** |
| 10 | 1 | Verifiability | Specify what kind of attacks, measures. Better phrasing would be hardening of system. Also focus points should be mentioned. |
| 10 | 2 | Verifiability / Realism | Provide a server / System up time in % Always isn't a reachable goal. |
| 10 | 4 | Realism | Not all Data is available offline due to storage and data protection (e.g. a device getting lost) instead of "most recent data" it should be stated "recently used data" (i.e. caching) |
| 10 | 5 | Comprehensibility | Not stated if small or big error tolerance or which context. |
| 10 | 6 | Verifiability | Not verifiable, consider "modular architecture" or "plugin supporting architecture" |
| 11 | 7 | Verifiability | Consider mentioning the kind of interfaces to provide (web service, API) |

# The score

Over all are most requirements well specified and overall, we didn’t notice a gross lack of features. Some core features which where eluded to in the specification where never specified individually. Some of the specifications could have been more precise.

The score we awarded was

7 / 10